

# NGDA Dataset Report

**Official NGDA Title:** US Canadian Boundary

**Metadata Record Title:**

**A-16 NGDA Theme:** Governmental Units, and Administrative and Statistical Boundaries

## Executive NGDA Theme Champion(s):

**Name:** Timothy F. Trainor

**Agency:** DOC-Census

**Email:** timothy.f.trainor@census.gov

## Theme Lead(s):

**Name:** Lynda Liptrap

**Agency:** Census

**Email:** lynda.a.liptrap@census.gov

## Dataset Manager(s):

**Name:** JT Moore

**Agency:** IBC

**Email:** moorej@ibcusca.org

## Metadata:

**Registration Status:** Pending

**Registered on**

**GeoPlatform Link\*:**

**Data.gov Metadata Link\*:**

\*If the metadata has been updated and reharvested after publication of this report, the link may no longer be valid. The dataset may be searched for manually in Data.gov or GeoPlatform.gov.

# NGDA Lifecycle Maturity Assessment (LMA) Report

## Time Frame:

Baseline assessment responses based on a start time of 2013 when business requirements were updated.

## LMA Submission:

**Status:** Complete

**Date:** 10/20/2015

**Extension Requested:** Yes

## LMA Reviewer(s):

**Supervisor:** JT Moore (moorej@ibcusca.org)

**Theme Lead:** Lynda Liptrap (lynda.a.liptrap@census.gov)

**Executive Champion:** Did not review

**SAOGI\*:** Did not review

**Other:** Did not review

## LMA Verifier:

**Name:** JT Moore

**Email:** moorej@ibcusca.org

## Attachments:

To get access to any attachments referenced in the report, email the LMA Help Desk at NGDA\_LMA\_help@fgdc.gov. Please use the subject "Dataset Report Attachment(s)" and indicate the associated official NGDA title.

\*Senior Agency Official for Geospatial Information (SAOGI)

## Lifecycle Maturity Assessment (LMA) Summary

### Overall Maturity:

**Transition; Transformation**

General Questions: 58%

**Managed; Predictable**

Stage 1 - Define/Plan: 45%

**Transition; Transformation**

Stage 2 - Inventory/Evaluate: 25%

**Managed; Predictable**

Stage 3 - Obtain: 52%

**Managed; Predictable**

Stage 4 - Access: 50%

**Managed; Predictable**

Stage 5 - Maintain: 41%

**Transition; Transformation**

Stage 6 - Use/Evaluate: 67%

**Managed; Predictable**

Stage 7 - Archive: 66%

**Managed; Predictable**

## NGDA Dataset Maturity Definitions:

**How To Calculate Maturity:** [https://www.geoplatform.gov/sites/default/files/How\\_to\\_Calculate\\_Maturity.pdf](https://www.geoplatform.gov/sites/default/files/How_to_Calculate_Maturity.pdf)

Maturity	Maturity Characteristics for All Lifecycle Stages
Optimized; Established Rank = 5	Dataset meets virtually all business needs of all users. The dataset is considered authoritative by owners and secondary users. It is curated across all stages of the approved lifecycle. Future needs are defined on a regular basis and resources for addressing both current and future business requirements are available.
Mature; Consistent Rank = 4	Dataset meets all the business needs of the primary owner and most of the secondary users. The dataset is curated and used as authoritative by the primary owner. Dataset is used widely by secondary users actively engaged in sustaining the dataset. Future needs are identified and steps are planned to address these. All stages are supported and reviewed on a recurring basis. The dataset is well managed in relation to the approved lifecycle.
Managed; Predictable Rank = 3	Dataset meets a significant number of the business needs of the primary owner and is widely used as an authoritative resource by secondary users. Benchmark activities are occurring in at least four of the approved lifecycle stages. Management practices in relation to the approved lifecycle is moderate but consistent. Dataset is integrating changing business requirements in lifecycle stages impacting overall maturity.
Transition; Transformation Rank = 2	Dataset meets business needs of the primary owner and has moderate use by secondary users. Benchmark activities are occurring in at least three stages. Efforts to integrate funding, include partners, and obtain data are not supported in a sustained manner. Management practices in relation to the stages of the approved lifecycle is limited.
Planned; Initial Development Rank = 1	Dataset limited in meeting business needs of the primary owner. Benchmark activities in the approved lifecycle are just starting to consider secondary uses, partnerships are forming to support additional dataset uses. Dataset development is in a very early stage. Minimal or limited management against the benchmarks in the approved lifecycle.
No Activity Rank = no activity	Dataset meets project or local business needs of the primary owner, secondary or additional uses or users were not considered, not recognized as an authoritative data or is part of a similar dataset. Not managed to any of the benchmarks in the approved lifecycle.

## General Questions for All Stages

1) Is there a recurring process to obtain funding for all lifecycle stages of this dataset?

**Answer:** Funding is planned at agency level, supporting staff assigned, but funding is not recurring, some lifecycle stages are supported.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

The International Boundary Commission is a bi-national organization. We rely on decisions to be made jointly between the United States and Canada. The staff is made up of a small amount of full-time employees whose main responsibility is maintaining the boundary. GIS and this dataset are a secondary responsibility for the IBC. Therefore we do not have direct funds dedicated to this dataset. We have however recently been allocating funds for GIS in general.

2) Is there a process in place to ensure that open government and transparency guidelines are followed in all lifecycle stages for this dataset?

**Answer:** Process under development.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

At this point we are still working on completing the first version of our dataset. We are taking into account open government initiatives during this process and hope to implement them in the future.

3) Are there processes and tools in place so that staff are sufficiently knowledgeable to ensure a continuity of the dataset for all stages of the lifecycle, especially during staffing transitions?

**Answer:** Processes and tools to ensure dataset continuity are in place and implemented for all lifecycle stages.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

We spent a large amount of time documenting our processes and procedures. In the past year we have gone through a thorough review with our Canadian counterparts. This review has lead to plentiful documentation of steps and procedures for creating and disseminating the dataset.

## STAGE 1 - Define/Plan

4) Are user and business requirements defined and formalized?

**Answer:** Ad hoc process is used for involving Partners/stakeholders in identifying requirements.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

Our documentation has mainly focused on quality assurance and development process. Therefore, we are a little behind on the partners/stakeholders area of the dataset. We are aware that this dataset has been requested by many stakeholders throughout the national government but because of our bi-national situation we must take extra time to ensure our products meet the criteria of United States and Canadian stakeholders.

5) How are partners/stakeholders involved in the requirements collection process?

**Answer:** Not Applicable (NA).

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

Partners and Stakeholders are typically not involved in the requirements and collection process. These requirements and collection are known best by the International Boundary Commission.

6) Is there a quality assurance process for the dataset?

**Answer:** Process established, significant portions of the documentation is complete.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

A majority of the past couple years have been focused on documentation and quality assurance. During this period we have made significant improvements to the dataset and the process involved in

creating the dataset. We hope this quality assurance will result in a better dataset than what we were prepared to provide a year ago. These documents are internal only and are available on our internal website for team members.

7) Is there a process to evaluate the sensitivity, privacy, and confidentiality of this dataset?

**Answer:** Process to define under development.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

Measures have been taken into consideration when dealing with sensitive data. However, for this particular dataset there is no sensitivity and therefore no reason to include them here. Other datasets that we curate go thru strict sensitivity and security standards.

8) Are defined data standards used in collecting, processing, and/or rendering the data?

**Answer:** Standards being implemented.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

We are currently using industry standards to describe our data. We use the ISO metadata standard to do so. These documents are internal only and are available on our internal website for team members.

## STAGE 2 - Inventory/Evaluate

9) Is there a process for determining if data necessary to meet requirements already exist from other sources (either within or outside the agency) before collecting or acquiring new data?

**Answer:** Process is under development to identify datasets promoting reuse and reduce unnecessary duplication.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

This question really does not apply to our situation. We are the authoritative data source for this dataset. The main responsibility of the International Boundary Commission is to maintain the boundary and providing this dataset helps us do so.

## STAGE 3 - Obtain

10) Is there a process for obtaining data in relation to this dataset?

**Answer:** Process is under development.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

We are currently undergoing a change in data model which will allow the process for obtaining data in relation to this dataset to be streamlined. We expect this data model to be functional in 2016.

11) Is the metadata in a FGDC endorsed geospatial metadata standard?

**Answer:** Metadata is available in a format endorsed by the FGDC, it fully describes the dataset and provides all the information required to make the dataset discoverable, accessible, and usable.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

Yes, we currently use the ISO standard. Metadata can be accessed thru our shapefile at: <http://internationalboundarycommission.org>

12) How complete is the geographic coverage as defined in the requirements for the dataset?

**Part 1 Answer:** Business requirement targets are on track, milestones are being met.

**Part 2 Answer:** Data set is roughly 50% of the geographic coverage is presently complete per current requirement.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

We currently have 16 of the 29 sections complete and quality controlled. We do not feel comfortable disseminating this dataset until we have achieved 100% quality control of the sections. We expect this to be in 2016

## STAGE 4 - Access

**13)** Do you have a process for providing users access to the data in an open digital machine readable format?

**Answer:** Process is developed and documentation started.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

Yes, we make the data available on our website which can be accessed here:

<http://internationalboundarycommission.org/index-eng.html> We are also undergoing a transition to a new website.

---

## STAGE 5 - Maintain

**14)** Is there a maintenance process for updating and storing the dataset?

**Answer:** Dataset maintenance process is identified and documented.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

During the shift to our new data model, alot of discussion and documentation went into updating and storing the dataset. Once the update has been complete we expect to be fully utilizing a maintenance process for updates and storage.

---

**15)** Is there an error correction process as part of dataset maintenance?

**Answer:** Error correction process under development.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

Yes, we are investigating different ways to handle error correction. This is a major decision that will be made soon between the two countries.

---

## STAGE 6 - Use/Evaluate

**16)** Is there a process to determine if the dataset meets user needs?

**Answer:** Process is being developed to determine if user needs are being addressed or met.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

We have yet to give much thought to this. We suspect that once we publish the dataset our users will let us know if they have different needs. Currently we rely on users reaching out to us about issues with the data.

---

**17)** Is there a process to provide users information on how to access and properly use the dataset?

**Answer:** Process implementation started for access and proper use.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

We have put consideration into access and use of the dataset. This is documented in the ISO metadata

---

**18)** Are the business processes and management practices assessed to meet changing technology?

**Answer:** Assessment process is fully implemented for taking advantage of changing technology, process is reviewed on a recurring basis.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

We are very much considering changing technology within our dataset. This was the main reason for undergoing a complete data model change.

---

## STAGE 7 - Archive

**19)** Is there an archiving process for the dataset?

**Answer:** Archival and/or processes are in early implementation.

**Justification Comment:**

**Attachment(s):** 0

Yes, this has been built into our new data model. These documents are internal only and are available on our internal website for team members.